

THE  
DIVINE LIGHT  
OF  
Christ in Man,  
AND HIS  
MEDIATION,  
Truly confessed by the  
People called Quakers.

IN  
A Brief and Gentle Examination of  
*John Norris* his Two Treatises  
concerning the *Divine Light*.

Intended to wipe off his undue Reflection of *Grossness* and *Confusion* on the  
*Quakers* Notion of the *Light within*.

WITH  
A POSTSCRIPT to J. N.

By G. W. a Servant of Christ.

*Ye believe in God, believe also in me, Jo. 14. 1.*

London: Printed for Thomas Northcott, in George-yard in Lombard-street, 1692.

202

THE

LIBRARY

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

AND

THE

NATURAL HISTORY

MUSEUM

OF LONDON

1841



*The Divine Light of Christ in Man  
and his Mediation, truly confessed  
by the People called Quakers.*

**I** Having had the opportunity lately to peruse two Treatises concerning the Divine Light, wherein the same Light as it is in Man is very much acknowledged and confest unto by the Author, beyond many if not most under his circumstances in our day, but withal finding that the People called *Quakers* are unduly charged by him as I apprehend, That they do confine the Light, as to the Act of Illumination, to certain Men, or to Men of a certain Order, namely their own Party. And that they make the Light within to be a Creature, yea a Material Creature, p. 23, 78, 1st Treat. and p. 18, 2d Treat. We the said People being thus charged so manifestly contrary to our sincere Belief, free and open, and frequent Profession and Testimony of and for the Divine Light of Christ, both as it is in all Men or Mankind, and as it is increated Supernatural and Divine. This gave me occasion the more carefully and narrowly to inspect the said two Treatises of the Divine Light, and to consider from what General Doctrines or Positions as held by the People called *Quakers*, the Author could with any colour of reason deduce such Consequences upon us the said People, as so confining the Act of Illumination only to those of our own Party, and that we make the Light within to be

but a Creature, &c. And I am sure I cannot find any such Inferences justly deduceable upon Us as a People, nor do I apprehend any particular approved Writers among Us justly chargeable therewith, their Writings on that Subject of the Light within and Universal Grace, &c. being duly inspected and impartially compared. And therefore in love to the Truth and Christian Respect and Tenderness to the Author of the said two Treatises, (*i. e.* J. N.) I had a concern upon my Spirit to give him and the World my Sentiments about the Matter objected and charged by him, according to that measure of Light and Understanding that God has been pleased to give me, not to raise controversy nor to give him or any others any real offence, nor to cause or widen any Differences or Breaches, but rather to lessen and compose them, wherein they may in Truth and a right Understanding be composed and quieted: for I have a love for the said Author, and the more, because he has so much confessed to the Truth of the Divine *Logos*, or *Light in Man*. Altho' by the way, I do take notice how passionately and angrily he is pleased to treat our Friend *Richard Vickris* with severe Reflections, hard Characters and Detractions, which I think do not well agree with his own Pretensions, nor suit his Circumstances. And altho' he seems hardly to resent some Reprehensions given him by *R. V.* in his Answer to him, which shews the reason thereof, yet I do not find that he has got any real advantage against *R. V.* in point of Doctrine or Testimony relating to the Divine Light, Spirit or Grace of God, but that *R. V.* has plainly and honestly asserted Truth therein: and I confess it is ingenuous in *J. N.* to Cite *R. V.* so fully as he has done.

As the People commonly called *Quakers* do sincerely believe and confess the Divine and Saving-Grace of God in Christ to be universally free to and for all Mankind, *so they do not confine the Divine Light of Christ as to the Act of Illumination to certain Men only, or only to Men of a certain Order, or to their own Party only,* (as unduly charged, p. 23, 78, 79. ) is evident from their own general Confession, that Christ as the Divine word, or  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{S}$ , *enlightens every Man coming into the World*, Joh. 1. 9. which must needs be an actual Enlightening; For how can it be said Christ enlightens every Man, but not actually? What Nonsense and Contradiction would this be?

And that R. Barclay, the Person charged, was not of the opinion so to confine the *actual Illumination* of this Divine Light in Man, see his own "Testimonies, viz. "For this end (that is for the "Restoration of Man) God hath communicated "and given unto every Man a Measure of the "Light of his Son, a Measure of Grace, or a Measure of the Spirit, which the Scripture expresseth by several Names, sometimes the Seed of "the Kingdom, *Matth.* 13. 18, 19. The Light that "makes all things manifest, *Ephes.* 5. 13. The "Word of God, *Rom.* 10. 18. or manifestation "of the Spirit given to profit withal, *1 Cor.* "12. 7. A Talent, *Matth.* 25. 15. A little "Leaven. The Gospel preached in every Creature, *Col.* 1. 23. And also that God in and "by this Light, invites, calls, exhorts and "strives with every Man, in order to save them, "(and is not this a plain confession to its *actual illumination* in every Man?) which, as it is "received, and not resisted, works the salvation of all, &c. [Thus far R. B. Apology, 330, 331.] And J. N. confesseth, *that the*  
Spi.

*Spirit of Truth (which R. B. esteems the Light to be the very same with) is really and truly God,*  
 p. 66, 67. (wherein it seems R. B. and F. N. are agreed). R. B. also declares of this Divine  
 "Light or Manifestation of the Holy Spirit gi-  
 "ven to every Man to profit withal; That now  
 "it were not profitable unto them, if it did  
 "not strive with them in order to convert them.  
 Thus R. B. fol. 66. And that the Light of  
 "Christ in a Turk, if minded, would reprove  
 "him both for committing Fornication and for  
 "Idolatry. — And that there is a possibility of  
 "Salvation to every Man during the day of his  
 "Visitation — which comes upon all at cer-  
 "tain times and seasons, wherein it (*i. e.* the  
 "Light or Grace of God) works powerfully  
 "upon the Soul, mightily tenders and breaks  
 "it, at which times, if Man resist it not, but  
 "close with it, he comes to know salvation by  
 "it. And moreover, concerning the Light's  
 "operation in the Hearts of all Men, R. B.  
 "saith, That as the Grace and Light in all is  
 "sufficient to save all, and of its own nature  
 "would save all, so it strives and wrestles with  
 "all for to save them; he that resists its stri-  
 "vings is the cause of his own condemnation;  
 "he that resists it not, it becomes his salva-  
 "tion. [Thus R. B. in his Apology, fol. 338,  
 339, 340.] and the like in fol. 354. "And of  
 "them who live at ease in their sins, 'tis be-  
 "cause their Deeds are evil, that with one con-  
 "sent they reject this Light, for (saith he) it  
 "checks the Wisest of them all and the Learn-  
 "edst of them all in secret, it reproves them;  
 "neither can all their Logick silence it, nor  
 "can the securest among them stop its voice  
 "from crying and reprovng them within, for  
 "all their confidence in the outward knowledge  
 "of

“ of Christ, or of what he hath suffered outwardly for them; for, as hath been often said  
 “ in a day, it strives with all, wrestles with all;  
 “ and it’s the unmortified Nature in the Wilest, in the Learnedest, &c. that denies this,  
 “ that despises it, that shuts it out to their own  
 “ condemnation; they come all under this description, *Every one that doth Evil, hateth the Light, neither cometh to the Light, lest his deeds should be reproved*, Joh. 3. 20. *Apology*, f. 355.

Thus far R. Barclay, with much more of this kind in his Works, which I forbear farther to recite here, being I think sufficient to evince to any rational and intelligent person, that he did not (nor do any of us) confine the Light of Christ within (in reference to the *Act of Illumination* or Enlightening) to certain Men, or to ourselves only, but the knowledge and experience of its more powerful operation unto salvation and deliverance of Man from Sin and Satan, is only effectually receiv’d and experienc’d in them who return inward unto and obey this Divine Light of Christ within when it unavoidably convicts and reproves them of Sin and Transgression, Christ being the Author of Eternal Salvation to them that obey him; tho’ he actually enlightens all, he saves only them that believe and obey him. And that R. Barclay did not believe this Divine and Saving-Light to be a *Creature*, as is inferred upon him, and the Quakers for his sake, pray observe his own Testimony, *Apology*, fol. 798. viz. *That the Quakers exhort People to believe in a meer Creature, is a meer Calumny*, (saith R. B.)

But now what ground has F. N. to charge the Quakers with confining the Light within, as to the *Act of Illumination*, as aforesaid? For I find no real cause he has thus to charge us from

from R. B. his speaking of the natural condition of Man, as fallen, degenerate, dead, and deprived of the sensation or feeling of this inward Testimony of the Seed of God, and as subject to the power, nature and seed of the Serpent — and that Man, as he is in this state, can know nothing aright, and that his thoughts and conceptions concerning God and things spiritual are unprofitable to himself and others, until he be dis-joined from this Evil Seed, and united to the Divine Light, P. 8. *Apol. fol. 310.* And that this holy, substantial Seed many times lyes in Man's Heart, as a naked Grain in stony Ground, *Apol. fol. 334.* Observe, Whence it does not follow, *That wicked Men who have the Light really and truly in them, yet are not actually enlightened by it, nor yet that it lyes dormant in them,* (as is inferred, p. 83.) For tho' natural, degenerate Man, dead in sins, and wicked, hard-hearted Men, have not the true sense and knowledge of the Divine Light it self, it follows not, that they are not at all or in any sense actually enlightened by it; for when they are at any time convicted and reproved of evil, judged and condemned in themselves for their wickedness and evil deeds, and excited to the contrary, they are thereby so far actually enlightened, tho' they know not that Light it self, nor what it is that doth so convict, reprove, and condemn them; the Spirit of Truth reproves the World of Sin, &c. yet they neither accept nor see it, (as they ought to do) and the Spirit many times blows or breaths upon them, yet they know not whence it comes, nor whither it goes, nor really what it is, tho' it does actually visit and enlighten them; the Sun shines and the Rain falls actually upon the stony and bar-



barren Ground; so the Lord causeth his Sun actually to arise upon the evil and the good, and the Rain to fall upon the just and unjust. And some grow past feeling and become judicially harden'd through their rebellion and presumptuous sinning against the Light. *How often is the Candle of the wicked put out, how oft is destruction upon him?* 'Tis therefore often lighted.

Concerning what F. N. is pleased to impute to the Quakers in general, viz. *That they do not hold their Light to be the very Substance and Essence of the Deity*, p. 39. Herein he is mistaken of the People call'd Quakers, who profess God to be *our Light and Salvation*. And I think his particular Instance from *Robert Barclay*, impartially considered and compared with other Instances of his, will fall so far short of proving the Charge upon the Quakers, that the contrary will appear for him and the Quakers in this case. His Instance for proof is, viz. That

Mr. Barclay saith, *By this Seed, Grace and Word of God and Light wherewith we say every Man is enlightened and hath a measure of it, which strives with them in order to save them, and which may by the stubbornness and wickedness of Man's will be quenched, bruised, wounded, pressed down, slain and crucified; We understand not the proper Essence and Nature of God precisely taken\*, but a spiritual, heavenly and invisible Principle, in which God, as Father, Son and Holy*

---

\* That is, as to his own distinct, *intire Essence*, purely considered, without relation to Man, or to the Suffering Nature or Spirit of the Man Christ Jesus, who suffered as Man, but not as God. 1. Pray what is it then in Man, that is or may be so bruised, wounded, pressed down, &c. as R. B. saith? 2. Can F. N. say 'tis the Proper Essence of God precisely taken? 3. What is the Seed the Son of Man sows in Mens hearts? *Matt. 13.* 4. And is nothing of the heavenly Man Christ in it? Pray consider.

*Ghost dwells; a measure of which divine and glorious life is in all Men as a Seed, &c. — and this we call Vehiculum Dei, or the Spiritual Body of Christ, the Flesh and Blood of Christ which came down from Heaven, p. 37, 38. On which J. N. observes thus, viz. I think 'tis plain, from this account Mr. Barclay gives of the Light, that tho' it be a Substance, yet 'tis not the same with, but really distinct from the substance of God, for 'tis not Deus, but Vehiculum Dei. (Thus far J. N.)*

*Ans. 1.* By the way, (being sensible where the stress of his Objection lyes, and what Words it most here pinches upon) I do sincerely propose, That the *Divine Light*, *λόγος*, or *Word of God*, cannot be confined to those or any such Explications (here objected) in a strict or literal sense; neither shall I insist upon the same; If J. N. should write another Book (or more) thereof, I shall not contest with him about varieties of Words and Terms (which he may have and know far more of than I) but for *Things* and *Substance*, knowing that the *Light* is very comprehensive and large in its extent and signification. 'Tis said that *God is Light*, and *Christ is the Light*, and the *Law is Light*, and the *Commandment a Lamp*, and the *Word* both a *Light* and *Laniborn*. By which manner of speaking, it may then be said, the *Word* is both the *Light* and its own *Vehicle*. And then why may not *Christ's Spiritual Body* which came down from Heaven, as well be a *Light*, as *Life*, *Aliment* or *Food* to the *Soul*? or as truly as the *Saints be the light of the World* (instrumentally) or *Light in the Lord*, who enlightens them? Is not *Christ intirely in all respects a Light*, as well as all other *Spiritual Good* to the *Soul*? For *Christ is not divided*.

*Ans. 2.* 'Tis certain, that *God is Light* (even the *Fountain and Fulness of all true Divine Light*)

Light) and in him is no darkness at all; and he hath shined in our hearts, to give us the light of the Knowledge of his Glory *in the Face of Christ* Jesus our Mediator and Way to the Father; God is our Light and Salvation in Christ. Therefore for any to suppose *R. B.* or the *Quakers* to hold or intend, that the *Divine Logos, Word, or true Light*, which enlightens all Men, *Job. 1.* is not the Divine Essence, or not of the Being or Substance of God, is wrongfully to suppose, that they oppose or deny the plain Testimony of *John the Evangelist*, which expressly saith, *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and that Word was God; the same was in the Beginning with God: and that In it was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men, Joh. 1.* Which Light therefore was of the very Essence and Substance of the Deity. 'Tis certain that Jesus Christ as God enlightens all Men, and as he is God and the heavenly Man he enlivens and quickens the true Believers and regenerates them into his own heavenly Image, *1 Cor. 15. 45. Psal. 119. 25, 37, 40, 50, 88, 93, 147, 154 Verses.* And I am sure *R. B.* and the People called *Quakers*, are so far from opposing or denying this Gospel-truth, that both they and he do sincerely own, believe, and confess it. See *R. B.*'s own Testimony, in his Works, quoted *fol. 11.* where he expressly saith, "*Christ is near unto every one, for in him we live and move and have our being; and this nearness of his unto all Men in a day, is more (i. e.) to them than the general presence, in respect whereof he abides with all the works of his hands, forasmuch as he is in them to enlighten them that they may believe, John 1. 9, &c.* Whence 'tis plain, that here he owns Christ, and even as God also, to be that true Light in all Men. And likewise in *fol. 63.* *R. B.* owns even

what his opposer grants, namely, "That the  
 "Light is in all Men, and that *Christ is in all*  
 "Men, in so far as his Light is in all Men, con-  
 "fessing Christ's Light to be in all Men, even in  
 "such as are not in Union with him, adding,  
 "That *where the Light is, there is Christ the Dona-*  
 "tor of it, which is all we say. (Thus far R. B.)  
 And in fol. 64. he confesseth, "An universal ma-  
 "nifestation of the Holy Spirit in every one,  
 "and that he that believeth in the Light belie-  
 "veth in Christ, for where the *Light of Christ is,*  
 "there is *Christ himself*, compared with fol. 65.  
 [Thus far R. B.] Wherein I hope F. N. and he  
 are agreed, viz. That this Divine Light in Man  
 is of the very Nature, Substance and Essence of  
 God, and his dear and only begotten Son Jesus  
 Christ. And therefore I wish F. N. would be  
 so charitable and tender as not to study either to  
 make or widen Differences or Breaches, in point  
 of Judgment where they are not in reality, if  
 Matters be impartially and truly lookt into and  
 compared.

3. But R. B. supposes a *Spiritual Body* of Christ,  
 (or Principle) which, says he, we call *Vehiculum*  
*Dei*, wherein God as Father, Son and Spirit dwells,  
 (or appear in Man, as he understands) and what  
 then? is this either to deny God or a Light of  
 his Divine Essence to be in Man, when it grants,  
 "God, both as Father, Son and Spirit, to be in  
 "such a Divine Principle as is in Man? yea, that  
 "Christ the Eternal Word, which was with God  
 "and was God, thus dwells in us, fol. 334. which  
 R. B. adds to the words before cited by F. N. a-  
 gainst him, wherein he truly supposes, that  
 Christ as in a Seed, or in such a Love (or Media-  
 tory) appearance in Men, may be pressed, cruci-  
 fied and slain, as to them who are said to crucifie  
 the Lord of Life afresh unto themselves, yet not as to  
 his

his own intire *Existence* or *Being*, nor as he is the Omnipotent God; for tho' Christ be a Lamb, and aspersed and crucified to many by their Iniquities, he is also a Lion, and hath power to stir up his strength even in *Man* when he pleases. And for the *Seed of Eternal Life to be sown in us*, and that the Lord would raise up his Power in us, these are not new, nor uncouth Expressions, but prayed for even in the Liturgy of the Church of *England*.

As to his words, which we call *Vehiculum Dei*, (speaking of the *Spiritual Body of Christ*) I conceive he speaks in condescension in the Person of some of the learned Writers or Philosophers who have used those Terms, and not in the Person of the People called *Quakers*, who are not only esteem'd an illiterate People, but are a plain, simple, innocent People, who most affect plain Scripture-Language, without any School Glosses, or Nice Distinctions, to deck, adorn, or illustrate their Christian Profession of Christ or of his Divine Light within, and many Thousands may not understand the terms, *Vehiculum Dei*, *Intermediate Being*, (nor the word *Idea's*, so much used by *J. N.*) Nor is Jesus Christ Preacht among us under those terms, but in Scripture-terms, both as he is truly God, and as he is the one Mediator between God and Men, even the Man Christ Jesus, as having an inward sight, sense and knowledge of him by his Divine Light, Spirit, Life and Power; so as we shall not need to fall out about the Names thereof, but prize the Excellency of the Knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord above all the World's Wisdom, natural and acquired Knowledge and Learning, for in him are all the hidden Treasures of true Wisdom and Knowledge. We who are a plain, simple-hearted People, who are content with what God has be-

bestowed upon us, are not willing to trouble our heads with curious Notions, nor with intricate, School Definitions and Distinctions about Words and Names, having an inward feeling of the principal thing, the root of the matter intended.

5. Concerning R. B.'s speaking of the *Spiritual Body of Christ*, as a heavenly, invisible and Divine Principle, and believing God as Father, Son and Spirit dwells therein, and are to be known and received therein; I think F. N. has no great reason to differ with him therein, much less to suppose thence, that he or we conclude, the Divine Light, or  $\lambda\gamma\theta$ , mention'd Job. 1. but a meer Creature. And considering that Doctrin of the *Spiritual Body* of Christ is that which R. B. intends in all his Discourse of that Subject, F. Norris himself cannot oppose, but rather, grants the probability thereof (and then where's the Controversie?). For which take a view of his own words, p. 38. 1st Treat. viz. "Whether there be  
 "any such thing as *Vehiculum Dei*, or *Spiritual Body*  
 "of Christ, (which is a Notion several learned  
 "Men both before and since the appearance of  
 "Quakerism have entertain'd upon the reading  
 "the 6th Chapter of St. John) I have neither  
 "Cause nor Mind at present to dispute, p. 38. 1st Treat. And to the same purpose he writes more fully and ingeniously in his second Treatise, p. 17. Which therefore I may here recite in his own words, viz. "And here, in the first  
 "place, I shall be so free and ingenuous as to declare, that I shall not stand with them concerning any of the *Five first Propositions*, which may  
 "be all true, for ought I know to the contrary.  
 "Particularly I shall not stand with them concerning the *Spiritual Body of Christ*, as distinct  
 "from that Natural Body wherein he was incarnate

"nate of the Virgin *Mary*: There may be such a  
 "thing for ought I know, or am able to shew  
 "to the contrary, and I know, that several among  
 "the Ancients have been of this opinion, alledg-  
 "ing for its foundation the sixth Chapter of  
 "St. *John*, which, to confess the truth, seems to  
 "favour it not a little. And this Hypothesis has  
 "been of late to the great surprise and amuse-  
 "ment of the stiffer and severer sort of Divines,  
 "re-advanced by a person of singular Note and  
 "Eminence in our Church, who makes use of it  
 "to salve and maintain the Doctrin of the Real  
 "Presence, supposing that while the Bodies of  
 "the Communicants feed upon the grosser Ele-  
 "ments of Bread and Wine, their Souls (as ma-  
 "ny of them as are fitly disposed) do take in and  
 "feed upon this Divine and *Spiritual Body* of  
 "Christ, which strengthens and nourishes their  
 "Inner Man, and becomes to them a *Principle of*  
 "*Regeneration and Spiritual Life*, as you may see  
 "more fully deduced in his Discourse of the *Real*  
 "*Presence*, particularly in the first and sixth Chap-  
 "ters of that Treatise. I shall not therefore, I  
 "say, contend with them concerning the *Spiritual*  
 "*Body of Christ*, either as to its Existence, or  
 "as to this its Use, whether there be such thing,  
 "or whether it be the *Principle of Regeneration* and  
 "*Spiritual Life* to the Saints: They may be both  
 "true, for ought I know, I see nothing absurd,  
 "or so much as improbable in them; and as I do  
 "not surrender up my full assent to what I can-  
 "not demonstrate to be true, so neither do I care  
 "to run down and condemn such Principles which  
 "I cannot prove to be false. (Thus far J. N.)  
 It may not be amiss here, to insert those 5 *first*  
*Propositions* before mentioned, which he has sup-  
 posed from our friend R. B. &c. and which he  
 declared he *shall not stand with us concerning any of*  
*them,*

them, for that they may be all true, for ought he knows to the contrary.

Prop. 1. p. 14, 15. " They (meaning the Quakers) suppose, that the Spiritual Life, or the " Life of Holiness and Grace, is a Substantial " Life, even as the Life of Vegetation, the Life " of Sensation, and the Life of Reason are all " substantial.

2. " They suppose, that this Substantial Life " is by the Vital Union of the Soul with some " body or other.

3. " They suppose, that this Body in the Vi- " tal Union of the Soul, with which Spiritual " Life does consist, is a certain *Divine or Celestial* " *Body*, even as the Natural Life does consist in " the Vital Union of the Soul with a Natural or " Terrestrial Body of the common Elementary " Consistence.

4. " They suppose, that Christ had two Bodies " of a distinct Original, and of a different Con- " texture, &c. -- a *Body* which he took from the " *Virgin Mary*, and a *Body* in which his Soul exist- " ed long before he took flesh of the *Virgin*.

These are the very words of Mr. Barclay. To the Question of his adversary, *Had Christ two Bodies?* He answers, *Yes*; and let him deny it if he dare, without contradicting the Scripture, *Job*. 6. 58. Christ speaks of his flesh which came down from Heaven; but this was not the Flesh he took from the *Virgin Mary*, for that came not down from Heaven, but he had a Spiritual Body, in which his *Soul* existed long before he took Flesh of the *Virgin*.

5. " They suppose, that this latter, the *Spiri- " tual Body of Christ*, is that *Divine or Celestial Bo- " dy* in the Vital Union of the Soul, with which " our Spiritual Life, or our Life of Grace does " consist, &c. That this is that heavenly *Manna*, " that



“ that *living Bread* discoursed of in the 6th of  
 “ *St. John*, that Divine *Aliment* upon which the  
 “ Saints do feed, and whereby they are nourished  
 “ unto Everlasting Life.

*Obj.* The premises (of the whole foregoing matters) seriously considered and compared, where's the great difference between *J. N.* and *R. B.*?

1. The one confesseth the Divine, Substantial Essence and Nature of the *Deity* to be that Light which is in Men.

The other confesseth God, as Father, Son, and Spirit, to be the Light in Men, and to be in that Seed, Principle, or Spiritual Body of Christ, which is (in some degree) in all Men.

2. The one confesseth the Divine Light of the Word that was with God to be in all Men.

The other confesseth Christ, who is that Word, to be in all Men, in some measure.

3. The one confesseth the Spiritual Body of Christ, (consequently Christ's being in that Body) The other cannot deny it, but rather assents to it.

4. Both confess the Light of Christ within to be a Divine, Substantial Light and Truth.

5. They differ not about the Divine Essence of the Light, as being of the Nature and Being of God and Christ, as he is the Divine Word or *Logos*, but somewhat about the *mode* or manner of its Being, (Discovery and Reception) as *in Man*; The one supposeth the very Essence and Substance of the Deity to be intimately united to our Minds; And the other, that 'tis *in us* as in a *Medium*, i. e. *in* the Spiritual Body of Christ, (which is rather assented unto than opposed) or in and through Christ as Mediator; for therein he is *God's Servant*, (most eminent) and *our Saviour*. See *Isai.* 42. 1, 6, 7. *ch.* 49. 6. *ch.* 52. 13. & 53. 11. *Zech.* 3. 8.

6. But the main difference is, That *J. N.* dislikes

likes and condemns is (in *R. B.* and *G. K.*) *their making the Spiritual Body of Christ to be the Light within*, p. 18. *Treat. 2d.* Concerning which, and his saying, *That not even the Soul of Jesus Christ — much less his Spiritual Body can ever be a Light to the Mind of Man*, p. 23. *Treat. 2d.* I ask him if any spiritual part of Jesus Christ, wherein he is received and knowable in *Man*, can be truly said to be no Light to the Mind or Soul of Man? How then says Christ himself, *I am the Light of the World; I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; No man cometh unto the Father, but by me?* *Joh. 14.* I could draw strange consequences on *J. N.* in this matter, but chuse at present to be sparing.

To conclude this Comparison for reconciliation. Although *R. B.* and *J. N.* acknowledge Christ the Divine Word, or *Λόγος*, to be the Light within, even that Light which enlightens all Men, the one supposeth 'tis as *in the Spiritual Body of Christ*; and the other cannot tell; he knows not but there may be such a thing; However both confess the Light to be a *Substantial Light*, of the Divine Essence and Nature of the Deity.

I think in the main the difference is not very great; not so great as to deserve such severe Reflections and Reproach from *J. Norris*; As, *That the Notion of the Light within, according as the Quakers explain and represent it, is really ridiculous enough to make the Patrons of it so. and well deserves all the scorn and contempt that is cast upon it*, p. 3, 4. *Treat. 2.*

But I must take leave to tell him, I cannot believe this his Reproach and Contempt which he hath cast on us and our Notion, (as he calls it) nor that it can any ways become his Profession, either thus to gratifie Scorners and Contemners,

or

or thus to teach the wicked their way, who scorn and contemn Religion and Truth; but rather I take it, that he writ this scornful and contemning Passage against us very inconsiderately, and from a groundless Passion; of which the Lord make him truly sensible, (and forgive him.) And also of his undue, censorious and scurrilous detraction, viz. *That the Quakers only Cant in some loose and general Expression about the Light, which they confirm with the Authority of St. John's Gospel, tho' they understand neither one nor another*, p. 24. Herein he was too censorious; we know in whom we have believed, (we thank God) and what inward sense and experience we have of his Light and Grace in our Hearts for Life and Salvation from Sin and Death: and what real change and reformation it has wrought and brought forth in us, in Life and Conversation; Blessed be the Lord our God for ever; Yea, we can sincerely say, Glory be to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

And seeing *J. N.* saith, *That to the like purpose, Mr. Keith, another of their most considerable Writers, speaking of the Seed of God, saith, &c.* By his words, *to the like purpose*, he means, like as *R. B.* hath declared about the *Spiritual Body of Christ, &c.*

To which I say then, what has been said for *R. B.* in the case, may serve for Answer to him about *G. K.* Howbeit, that Faithful Man, *R. B.* being gone to his rest, and not here to answer for himself, I was the more concerned to take notice of him, and of his own Explications in this Matter. It may be *R. Vickers* (or some else) may find cause to answer *J. N.*'s two Treatises more particularly and fully for themselves; but that I leave.

What *J. N.* saith, "That to be a *Light* to the  
C 2 "Mind

" Mind of Man, is to be to it the Principle of  
 " Understanding, to furnish it with *Idea's*, and  
 " to be the immediate Object of its Conception,  
 " immediately present to the Mind, and to have  
 " the whole perfection of being the *Idea's* of all  
 " things, and to be an Universal Representa-  
 " tive, which conditions ( especially the last )  
 " no creature either has or can possibly have ;  
 " and therefore no creature is able to be a Light  
 " to the Soul of Man, p. 23. *Treat. 2.*

These Propositions we shall not need to dis-  
 pute, nor oppose the Inference, which affects  
 not our Principle of the Divine and increated  
 Light of God and Christ in Man, and therefore  
 shall not need to examine J. N.'s large Philoso-  
 phical Demonstrations of the same, Propositi-  
 ons being not denied, but the same in effect as-  
 serted by R. B. In his concluding it, " A meer  
 " Calumny for any one to say, That the *Quakers*  
 " Exhort People to believe in a meer Creature,  
*Appl. 798.* Besides, where such Creatures as the  
 Saints in Christ were called the *Lights* of the  
 World, and the *Salt* of the Earth, and those that  
 were sometimes Darkness, were become Light in  
 the Lord when converted, they were *such* not of  
 themselves, nor as meer Creatures, but as join-  
 ed and united unto ( and made partakers of )  
 Christ Jesus, and to God *in him*, who was their  
 Light, their Life, and Salvation, and that hea-  
 venly Salt that seasoned and sanctified them. And  
 if they were Light *in the Lord*, who was their  
 Light, much more Christ Jesus, who is the Foun-  
 tain of Divine Light and Universal Illumination,  
 in whose Light ( and not as in a Creature ) Men  
 ought to believe, that they may be Children of  
 the Light. And although we believe in God,  
 through Jesus Christ, and 'tis through him as  
 our Mediator, that our Faith is truly in God,  
 and

and not without respect to Christ, and living Faith in him, he being the Author of our Living and Divine Faith, who said, *Ye believe in God, believe also in me*, Joh. 14. 1.

'Tis evident, that accordingly R. B. testifies unto Jesus Christ the Son of God, both as *God* and *Man*, Creator and Mediator, saying, (*Apol. p. 274, 275.*) 1. "That Word that was in the Beginning with God, and was God, by whom all things were made, &c. and that this is that Jesus Christ by whom God created all things; by whom and for whom all things were created that are in Heaven and Earth, &c. *Col. 1. 16.* "Who therefore is called the First-born of every Creature, *Col. 1. 15.* As then that infinite and incomprehensible Fountain of Life and Motion appeareth in the Creatures, by his own Eternal Word and Power. 2. "So no Creature has access again unto him, but in and by the Son, according to his own express words. See *Matt. 11. 27. Luke 10. 22. Joh. 14. 6.* Hence he is fitly called the Mediator betwixt God and Man, &c. And that there is no knowledge of the Father, but by the Son, and that he is the only Mediator, p. 368.

## P O S T S C R I P T.

Friend, *John Norris*,

ON the serious perusal of the Controversie,  
1. I do not find, that thou hast exalted the Divine Light of God, and his dear Son, more than the People called *Quakers*, yet am glad thou hast exalted it so much as thou hast done, beyond many (if not most) of thy Brethren; and I truly wish thy mind may be turned into it, and kept in it, out of all fleshly Wisdom and Imaginations, that

that thou mayest feel true Divine Life, Power and Wisdom in it, as well as have a Notion of it.

2. I do not see but our Friends exalt Jesus Christ, as Mediator betwixt God and Men, more than thy self: For which please to consider,

1. Thy supposing the very Essence and Substance of the Deity to be so intimately united to our Minds, as that there can be no Medium between God and the Creature, p. 22. Treat. 1. p. 8. Treat. 2.

2. Thy supposing the Light within to be a Man's natural and ordinary way of Understanding, and saying, *This is Reason, this is Conscience*, (speaking of the Light) p. 22. & 55. Tr. 1. [This I think contradicts the foregoing Supposition. Only it seems to be qualified with thy meaning no more than that this (the Light) is that whereby I perform acts of Reason and acts of Conscience. May not R. B. be as easily reconciled about the Light, and the Spiritual Body of Christ, thinkest thou?] ]

3. Thy supposing, that neither the Soul of Jesus Christ, nor his Spiritual Body, can ever be a Light to the Mind of Man, p. 23. Tr. 2.

In these three Suppositions, may not I suppose thou leavest no room for Jesus Christ as Mediator, in any degree in Men? Or hast thou not only said as much herein, as one called a *Deist* may say, without relation to Jesus Christ, as manifest in several degrees, appearances and operations in Man, as we truly feel him and confess him?

Yet I still confess thou hast suppos'd and profest many general Truths in thy Books in respect to the *Divine Light within*; As,

“ That to be actually enlighten'd by this Light,  
“ is the Universal Benefit of all Men, yea, of all  
“ the Intelligent Creation, p. 23.

“ That 'tis the Essential Truth of God,— yet  
“ that it does not formally enlighten or instruct

me,

" me, but when I attend to it, and consult it, &c.  
p. 24.

" That in thy account, it (the Divine Light)  
" is the very *Essence* and *Substance* of the *Deity*,  
" exhibitiv of *All Truth*, p. 36.

" On *Job. 1. 4.* *In him was Life, and the life was*  
" *the Light of Men*; that if the Proposition be  
" understood formally, then it proves, that 'tis  
" not only a Substance, but also a Divine Sub-  
" stance, strictly speaking even the very *Essence*  
" of the *Deity*, &c. p. 40.

" Not that I would be thought to deny the *Di-*  
" *vine Light* to be Grace, as to the certain de-  
" grees of it; so far from that, that I think it to  
" be the *greatest Grace* of God, that is with re-  
" spect to the degrees of it, &c. p. 46.

" I in this very Book -- as well as in the whole  
" course of my other Writings upon this occasion,  
" do all along earnestly contend, that this *internal*  
" *Light* is no other than the very *Essence* and  
" Substance of God, &c. p. 53, 54. [Thus far  
thou *J. N.*] with much more of the same im-  
port.

Now, Friend, (*J. N.*) Hadst thou only in-  
sisted on these Truths, and let the People of God  
called *Quakers* alone, and not reproacht them  
with *Grossness*, *Confusion*, &c. it had saved both  
thy self and us farther trouble: I would not have  
thee reproach or vilifie us any further, but seri-  
ously with the *Light of Truth* consult and consi-  
der what will make most for thy own inward  
Peace and quiet Life, and if thou art reflected on  
by any of thy Brethren or Society for confessing  
the true *Light*, let not that be a Temptation to  
thee to evade Truth or reproach us. Many of thy  
Brethren of the Clergy might see and confess  
more of the *Divine Light* in Man than they do, if  
Avarice, Preaching for Hire, Filthy Lucre,  
Great

Great Livings, and Worldly Preferments did not blind their Eyes, cloud their Understandings and choak the Good Seed in them ; therefore have a care thereof.

Our Testimony for the *Divine Light*, may be farther seen in many of our ancient Friends Writings, as *Samuel Fisher's* large Book, Entituled, *Rusticus ad Academicos*, and many of *Geo. Fox's* Books, and *William Dewsbury's* Works, (with divers others) to which I refer thee ; but chiefly to the *Divine Light* (confess'd) in thy self, for Information and a right Understanding : Which I desire the Lord to give thee ; Who am

London, the 22d

7 Mo. 1692.

A real Friend to thy  
Soul ; and a Well-  
wisher to thee, and  
all Men,

G. Whitehead.

B O O K S Printed for Tho. Northcott, in George-  
yard in Lombard-street.

**R**obert Barclay's Works, Collected into one  
Volume. Price bound, 13 s.

John Burnyat's Works, 2 s. 6 d.

G. Keith's Answer to the Presbyterians in  
New England, 1 s. 6 d.

— His Way to the City of God, 1 s.

— His Fundamental Truths of Christia-  
nity, 8 d.

15 MAY 1906

MUSEUM